arXiv:math/9808140v1 [math.LO] 15 Aug 1998

NOT COLLAPSING CARDINAL $\leq \kappa$ IN $(< \kappa)$-SUPPORT ITERATION

PART II

SH667

Saharon Shelah

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Rutgers University
Mathematics Department
New Brunswick, NJ USA

Abstract. We deal with $(< \kappa)$-supported iterated forcing notions which are $(\hat{\mathcal{E}}_0, \hat{\mathcal{E}}_1)$-complete, have in mind problems on Whitehead groups, uniformizations and the general problem. We deal mainly with the successor of a singular case. This continues [Sh:587]. We also deal with complimentary combinatorial results.

I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.
Notes - Spring '96
First Typed - 97/June/30
Latest Revision - 98/Aug/26

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$-TEX

Annotated Content

§1 GCH implies for successor of singular no stationary S has uniformization

[For λ strong limit singular, for stationary $S \subseteq S^{\lambda^+}_{\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)}$ we prove strong negation of uniformization for some S-ladder system and even weak versions of diamond. E.g. if λ is singular strong limit $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$, then there are $\gamma^\delta_i < \delta$ increasing in $i < \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$ with limit δ such that for every $f : \lambda^+ \to \alpha^* < \lambda$ for stationarily many $\delta \in S$, for every $i, f(\gamma^\delta_{2i}) = f(\gamma^\delta_{2i+1})$.]

§2 Forcing for successor of singulars

[Let λ be strong limit singular $\kappa = \lambda^+ = 2^\lambda, S \subseteq S^\kappa_{\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)}$ stationarily not reflecting. We present the consistency of a forcing axiom saying e.g.: if h_δ is a function from A_δ to $\theta, A_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(A_\delta)$, $\mathrm{otp}(A_\delta) = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda), \theta < \lambda$ then for some $h : \kappa \to \theta$ for every $\delta \in S$ we have $h_\delta \subseteq^* h$.]

§3 κ^+-c.c. and κ^+-pic

[In the forcing axioms we would like to allow forcing notions of cardinality $> \kappa$; for this we use a suitable chain condition (allowed here and in [Sh 587].]

§4 Existence of non-free Whitehead groups (and $\mathrm{Ext}(G, \mathbb{Z}) = 0$) abelian groups in successor of singulars

[We use the information on the existence of weak version of the diamond for $S \subseteq S^{\lambda^+}_{\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)}, \lambda$ strong limit singular with $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$, to prove that there are some abelian groups with special properties (from reasonable assumptions).]

§1 GCH IMPLIES FOR SUCCESSOR OF SINGULAR NO STATIONARY S HAS UNFORMIZATION

We show that the improvement in [Sh 587] over [Sh 186] for inaccessible (every ladder on S rather than some) cannot be done for successor of singulars. This is continued in §4.
1.1 Fact: Assume

- (a) λ is strong limit singular with $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$, let $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda) = \sigma$
- (b) $S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda^+ : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \sigma\}$ is stationary.

Then we can find $\langle < \gamma^\delta_i : i < \sigma >: \delta \in S\rangle$ such that

- (α) γ^δ_i is increasing (in i) with limit δ
- (β) if $\mu < \lambda$ and $f : \lambda^+ \to \mu$ then the following set is stationary: $\{\delta \in S : f(\gamma^\delta_{2_i}) = f(\gamma^\delta_{2i+1})$ for every $i < \sigma\}$.
  Moreover
- $(\beta)^+$ if $f_i : \lambda^+ \to \mu_i, \mu_i < \lambda$ for $i < \sigma$ then the following set is stationary: $\{\delta \in S : f_i(\gamma^\delta_{2i}) = f_i(\gamma^\delta_{2i+1})$ for every $i < \sigma\}$.

Proof. This will prove 1.2, too. We first concentrate on $(\alpha) + (\beta)$ only.
Let $\lambda = \sum\limits_{i<\sigma} \lambda_i, \lambda_i$ increasingly continuous, $\lambda_{i+1} > 2^{\lambda_i}, \lambda_0 > 2^\sigma$. For $\alpha < \lambda^+$, let $\alpha = \bigcup\limits_{i<\sigma} a_{\alpha,i}$ such that $|a_{\alpha,i}| \le \lambda_i$. Without loss of generality $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \delta$ divisible by λ^ω (ordinal exponentiation). For $\delta \in S$ let $\langle \beta^\delta_i : i < \sigma\rangle$ be increasingly continuous with limit δ, β^δ_i divisible by λ and > 0. For $\delta \in S$ let $\langle b^\delta_i : i < \sigma\rangle$ be such that: $b^\delta_i \subseteq \beta^\delta_i, |b^\delta_i| \le \lambda_i, b^\delta_i$ is increasingly continuous and $\delta = \bigcup\limits_{i<\sigma} b^\delta_i$ (e.g. $b^\delta_i = \bigcup\limits_{j_1,j_2<i} a_{\beta^\delta_{j_1,j_2}} \cup \lambda_i$). We further demand $\beta^\delta_i \ge \lambda \Rightarrow \lambda_i \subseteq b^\delta_i \cap \lambda$. Let $\langle f^*_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$ list the two-place functions with domain an ordinal $< \lambda^+$ and range $\subseteq \lambda^+$. Let $S = \bigcup\limits_{\mu<\lambda} S_\mu$, with each S_μ stationary and $\langle S_\mu : \mu < \lambda\rangle$ pairwise disjoint.
We now fix $\mu < \lambda$ and will choose $\bar\gamma^\delta = \langle \gamma^\delta_i : i < \sigma\rangle$ for $\delta \in S_\mu$ such that clause (α) holds and clause (β) holds (for every $f : \lambda^+ \to \mu$), this clearly suffices.
Now for $\delta \in S_\mu$ and $i < j < \sigma$ we can choose $\zeta^\delta_{i,j,\varepsilon}$ (for $\varepsilon < \lambda_j$) (really here we use just $\varepsilon = 0, 1$) such that:

- (A) $\langle \zeta^\delta_{i,j,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda_j\rangle$ is a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals
- (B) $\beta^\delta_i < \zeta^\delta_{i,j,\varepsilon} < \beta^\delta_{i+1}$, (can even demand $\zeta^\delta_{i,j,\varepsilon} < \beta^\delta_i + \lambda$)
- (C) $\zeta^\delta_{i,j,\varepsilon} \notin \{\zeta^\delta_{i_1,j_1,\varepsilon} : j_1 < j, \varepsilon < \lambda_{j_1}$ (and $i_1 < \theta$, really only $i_1 = i$ matters)$\}$
- (D) for every $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in b^\delta_j$, the sequence $\langle \mathrm{Min}\{\lambda_j, f^*_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2, \zeta^\delta_{i,j,\varepsilon}) : \varepsilon < \lambda_j\}\rangle$ is constant i.e.: either

$$\varepsilon < \lambda_j \Rightarrow (\alpha_2, \zeta^\delta_{i,j,\varepsilon}) \notin \ \mathrm{Dom}(f^*_{\alpha_1})$$

$$\underline{\text{or}} \bigwedge_{\varepsilon<\lambda_j} f^*_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2, \zeta^\delta_{i,j,\varepsilon}) = f^*_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2, \zeta^\delta_{i,j,0})$$

$$\underline{\text{or}} \bigwedge_{\varepsilon<\lambda_j} f^*_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2, \zeta^\delta_{i,j,\varepsilon}) \geq \lambda_j.$$

We can add $\langle f^*_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2, \zeta^\delta_{i,j,\varepsilon}) : \varepsilon < \lambda_j\rangle$ is constant or strictly increasing (or all undefined).
Let $G = \{g : g$ a function from σ to 2^σ such that $(\forall i < \sigma)(i < g(i)\}$.
For each function $g \in G$ we try $\bar\gamma^{g,\delta} = \langle \zeta^\delta_{i,g(i),0}, \zeta^\delta_{i,g(i),1} : i < \sigma\rangle$ i.e. $\langle \gamma^{g,\delta}_{2i}, \gamma^{g,\delta}_{2i+1}\rangle = \langle \gamma^\delta_{i,g(i),0}, \gamma^\delta_{i,g(i),1}\rangle$.
Now we ask for each $g \in G$:

$\underline{\text{Question}}^\mu_g$: Does $\langle \bar\gamma^{g,\delta} : \delta \in S_\mu\rangle$ satisfy
$(\forall f \in {}^{\lambda^+}\mu)(\exists^{\text{stat}}\delta \in S_\mu)(\bigwedge_{i<\theta} f(\gamma^{g,\delta}_{2i}) = f(\gamma^{g,\delta}_{2i+1}))?$.

If for some $g \in G$ the answer is yes, we are done. Assume not, so for each $g \in G$ we have $f_g : \lambda^+ \to \mu$ and a club E_g of λ^+ such that:

$$\delta \in S_\mu \cap E_g \Rightarrow (\exists i < \sigma)(f_g(\gamma^{g,\delta}_{2i}) \neq f_g(\gamma^{g,\delta}_{2i+1}))$$

which means

$$\delta \in S_\mu \cap E_g \Rightarrow (\exists i < \sigma)[f_g(\zeta^\delta_{i,g(i),0}) \neq f_g(\zeta^\delta_{i,g(i),1})].$$

Let $G = \{g_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < 2^\sigma\}$, so we can find a 2-place function f^* from λ^+ to μ satisfying $f^*(\varepsilon, \alpha) = f_{g_\varepsilon}(\alpha)$ when $\varepsilon < 2^\sigma, \alpha < \lambda^+$. Hence for each $\alpha < \lambda^+$ there is $\gamma[\alpha] < \lambda^+$ such that $f^* \restriction \alpha = f^*_{\gamma_\alpha}$.

Let $E^* = \bigcap_{\varepsilon<2^\sigma} Eg_\varepsilon \cap \{\delta < \lambda^+ :$ for every $\alpha < \delta$ we have $\gamma[\alpha] < \delta\}$. Clearly it is a club of λ^+, hence we can find $\delta \in S_\mu \cap E^*$. Now $\beta^\delta_{i+1} < \delta$ hence $\gamma[\beta^\delta_{i+1}] < \delta$ (as $\delta \in E^*$) but $\delta = \bigcup_{i<\sigma} b^\delta_i$ hence for some $j < \sigma, \gamma[\beta^\delta_{i+1}] \in b^\delta_j$; as b^δ_j increases with j we can define a function $h : \sigma \to \sigma$ by $h(i) =$ Min$\{j : j > i+1$ and $\mu < \lambda_j$ and $\gamma[\beta^\delta_{i+1}] \in b^\delta_j\}$. So $h \in G$ hence for some $\varepsilon(*) < 2^\theta$ we have $h = g_{\varepsilon(*)}$. Now looking at the choice of $\zeta^\delta_{i,h(i),0}, \zeta^\delta_{i,h(i),1}$ we know (remember $2^\sigma < \lambda_0 \leq \lambda_j$)

$$(\forall \varepsilon < 2^\sigma)(\forall \alpha \in b^\delta_{h(i)})(f^*_\alpha(\varepsilon, \zeta^\delta_{i,h(i),0}) = f^*_\alpha(\varepsilon, \zeta^\delta_{i,h(i),1})).$$

In particular this holds for $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(*), \alpha = \gamma[\beta^\delta_{i+1}]$, so we get

$$f^*_{\gamma[\beta^\delta_{i+1}]}(\varepsilon(*), \zeta^\delta_{i,h(i),0}) = f^*_{\gamma[\beta^\delta_{i+1}]}(\varepsilon(*), \zeta^\delta_{i,h(i),1}).$$

By the choice of f^* and of $\gamma[\beta^\delta_{i+1}]$ this means

$$f_{g_{\varepsilon(*)}}(\zeta^\delta_{i,h(i),0}) = f_{g_{\varepsilon(*)}}(\zeta^\delta_{i,h(i),1})$$

but $h = g_{\varepsilon(*)}$ and the above equality means $f^*_{g_{\varepsilon(*)}}(\gamma^{g_{\varepsilon(*)},\delta}_{2i}) = f^*_{g_{\varepsilon(*)}}(\gamma^{g_{\varepsilon(*)},\delta}_{2i+1})$, and this holds for every $i < \sigma$, and $\delta \in E^* \Rightarrow \delta \in E_{g_{\varepsilon(*)}}$ so we get a contradiction to the choice of $(f_{g_{\varepsilon(*)}}, E_{\varepsilon(*)})$.
So we have finished proving $(\alpha) + (\beta)$.

How do we get $(\beta)^+$ of 1.1, too?

The first difference is in phrasing the question, now it is, for $g \in G$:

Question$^\mu_g$: Does $\langle \bar\gamma^{g,\delta} : \delta \in S_\mu \rangle$ satisfies:

$$\Big((\forall f_0 \in {}^{\lambda^+}\mu_0)(\forall f_1 \in {}^{\lambda^+}\mu_1)\dots(\forall f_i \in {}^{\lambda^+}\mu_i)\dots\Big)_{i<\sigma} (\exists^{\rm stat}\delta \in S_\mu)(\bigwedge_{i<\sigma} f_i(\gamma^{g,\delta}_{2_i}) = f_i(\gamma^{g,\delta}_{2i+1})).$$

If for some g the answer is yes, we are done, so assume not so we have $f_{g,i} \in {}^{\lambda^+}(\mu_i)$ for $g \in G, i < \sigma$ and club E_g of λ^+ such that

$$\delta \in S_\mu \cap E_g \Rightarrow (\exists i < \sigma)(f_{g,i}(\gamma^{g,\delta}_{2i}) \neq f_{g,i}(\gamma^{g,\delta}_{2i+1})).$$

A second difference is the choice of f^* as $f^*(\sigma\varepsilon + i, \alpha) = f_{g_\varepsilon,i}(\alpha)$ for $\varepsilon < 2^\sigma$,
$i < \sigma, \alpha < \lambda^+$.
Lastly, the equations later change slightly. $\square_{1.1}$

1.2 Fact: Under the assumptions of 1.1 letting $\bar\lambda = \langle \lambda_i : i < \sigma \rangle$ be increasingly continuous with limit λ we have

$(*)_1$ we can find $\langle < \gamma^\delta_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda >: \delta \in S \rangle$ such that

- (α) γ^δ_i is increasing in i with limit δ
- $(\beta)^+$ if $f_i : \lambda^+ \to \lambda_{i+1}$, for $i < \sigma$, then the following set is stationary $\{\delta \in S : f_i(\gamma^\delta_\zeta) = f_i(\gamma^\delta_\xi)$ when $\zeta, \xi \in [\lambda_i, \lambda_{i+1})\}$

$(*)_2$ moreover if $F_i : [\lambda^+]^{<\lambda} \to [\lambda^+]^{\lambda^+}$ for $i < \sigma$, then we can demand

- (i) $\{\gamma^\delta_\zeta : \zeta \in [\lambda_i, \lambda_{i+1}]\} \subseteq F_i(\{\gamma^\delta_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda_i\})$,
- (ii) $|\{\langle \gamma^\delta_\zeta : \zeta < \zeta^* \rangle : \gamma^\delta_{\zeta^*} = \gamma\}| \leq \lambda$ for each $\gamma < \lambda^+$ and $\zeta^* < \sigma$

$(*)_3$ moreover, if $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ is given, it guess clubs, $C_\delta = \{\alpha[\delta, i] : i < \sigma\}, \alpha[\delta, i]$ divisible by λ^ω increasing in i with limit $\delta, \langle \mathrm{cf}(\alpha[\delta, i+1]) : i < \sigma \rangle$ is increasing with limit λ letting $\beta(\delta, i) = \sum_{j<i} \lambda_j \times \mathrm{cf}(\alpha[\delta, j])$ we can demand $\sup\{\gamma^\delta_i : \gamma^\delta_i < \beta[\delta, j]\} = \alpha[\delta, j]$ (and in $(\beta)^+$ the division to intervals is by the $\beta[\delta, j]$ not $[\lambda_i, \lambda_{i+1}]$) and for every $f_i \in {}^{(\lambda^+)}(\mu_i)$ for $i < \sigma$ where $\mu_i < \lambda$ and club E of λ^+, for stationarily many $\delta \in S$ we have $\{\gamma^\delta_i : i < \lambda\} \subseteq E$ and $f_i(\gamma^\delta_\zeta) = f_i(\gamma^\delta_\varepsilon)$, when $\zeta, \varepsilon \in [\beta[\delta, i], \beta[\delta, i+1])$.

Proof. The same proof as in 1.1 for $(*)_1$.

Minor changes for $(*)_2, (*)_3$. For clause (ii) of $(*)_2$ note that we can find $\langle \mathscr{P}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ such that:

- (a) $\mathscr{P}_\alpha \subseteq [\alpha]^{<\lambda}$,
- (b) if $A \subseteq \alpha$ then for some $\bar{A} = \langle A_i : i < \sigma \rangle$ we have: A_i is increasingly continuous, $A_i \in \mathscr{P}_\alpha$ and $A = \bigcup\limits_{i<\sigma} A_i$
- (c) $\mathscr{P}_\alpha$ is closed under union of $< \sigma$ members.

§2 Case C:Forcing for successor of singular

See [Sh 587](xxx).

2.1 Hypothesis. 1) λ strong limit singular $\sigma = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) < \lambda, \kappa = \lambda^+, \mu^* \geq \kappa, 2^\lambda = \lambda^+$.
2) $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0 \subseteq \{\bar{a} : \bar{a} = \langle a_i : i \leq \delta \rangle, a_i \in [\mu^*]^{<\kappa}$ increasingly continuous, $\lambda \subseteq a_0\}$ non-trivial (i.e. for $\theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) < \lambda, \chi$ large enough and $x \in \mathscr{H}(\chi)$ we can find $\langle N_i : i \leq \theta \rangle$ obeying $\bar{a} \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$ (with error some n see [Sh 587, xx] and such that $x \in N_0$).
3) $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_1 \subseteq \{\bar{a} : \bar{a} = \langle a_i : i \leq \sigma \rangle, a_i$ increasingly continuous $|a_i| < \lambda, \lambda + 1 \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{i<\sigma} a_i\}$.

2.2 Definition. $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_1)$ non-trivial if:

- (a) $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$ is non-trivial
- (b) for χ large enough and $x \in \mathscr{H}(\chi)$, we can find $\bar{M} = \langle M_i : i \leq \sigma \rangle$ and $\langle \bar{N}^i : i < \sigma \rangle$ such that
  - (α) $M_i \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in, <^*_\chi)$ and
  - (β) $\bar{M}$ obeys some $\bar{a} \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_1$ for some finite error and
  - (γ) $[M_{i+1}]^{2^{\|M_i\|}} \subseteq M_{i+1}$
  - (δ) $N^i_\alpha \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in, <^*_\chi)$ and
  - (ε) $\langle N^i_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta_i \rangle = \bar{N}^i$ obeys some $\bar{b}_i \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$ for some finite error
  - (ζ) $M_{i+1} \subseteq N^i_{\delta_i}$
  - (η) $\delta_i \subseteq M_{i+1}$,
  - (θ) $\mathrm{cf}(\delta_i) > 2^{\|M_i\|}$,
  - (ι) $\alpha < \delta_i \Rightarrow \bar{N}^i \restriction \alpha \in M_{i+1}$
  - (κ) $N^i_{\delta_i} \prec N^j_0$ for $i < j$
  - (λ) $M_i \prec N^i_0, M_i \in N^i_0$
  - (μ) if $\beta < \sigma$ is a limit ordinal, then $\langle N^i_{\delta_i} : i < \beta \rangle\hat{\ }\langle \bigcup\limits_{i<\beta} N^i_{\delta_i} \rangle$ obeys some $\bar{a}^\beta \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$ (needed for the ghost coordinates).

Remark. 1) Letting $\bar{N} = \bar{N}^0\hat{\ }\bar{N}^1 \ldots$ and $N_\varepsilon = N^i_\alpha$ if $\varepsilon = \sum\limits_{j<i} \delta_j + \alpha$ then $\ell g(\bar{N}) = \lambda$ and $\bar{N} \restriction (i_0 + 1) \in N_{i_0+1}$ so $\bar{N}$ is $\prec$-increasingly continuous, $\bar{N} \restriction \gamma \in N_{i+1}$. Note $\bigcup\limits_i N^i_{\delta_i} = \bigcup\limits_i N^i_0 = M_\sigma$.
2) [Variant: $\delta_i = \sup(\delta_i \cap M_{i+1}), \alpha \in \delta_i \cap M_{i+1} \Rightarrow \bar{N}^i \restriction \alpha \in M_{i+1}$. Saharon check.]
3) Clearly $(b) \Rightarrow (a)$ in Definition 2.2.

2.3 Definition. Q is [strongly] $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$-complete: as in the inaccessible case.

2.4 Claim. *1) Assume $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$ is non-trivial and we have $(<\kappa)$-support iteration $\bar Q$, and (non-trivial) $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$, $\Vdash_{P_i}$ "$\underset{\sim}{Q}_i$ is $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$-complete".*

Then P_γ is $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$-complete (hence P_γ/P_β).
2) Q is $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$-complete $\Rightarrow V^Q \models \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$ non-trivial.

Proof. Just like the inaccessible (here the choice "for any regular cardinal $\theta < \kappa$" rather than "for any cardinal $\theta < \kappa$" is important).

2.5 Definition. Q is $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_1)$-complete if:

(A) Q is strongly $\mathscr{E}_0$-complete

(B) For some x if $x \in \mathscr{H}(\chi)$ and $\bar M, \langle \bar N^i : i < \sigma\rangle$ are as in Definition 2.2, then ($Q \in M_0$, and)

$(*)$ for any $i_0 < \sigma$ and $r \in M_{i_0+1} \cap Q$, in the following game between the players COM and INC, the player INC has no winning strategy, we index the moves by $i \in [i_0, \sigma)$, in the ith move the player COM chooses $p_i \in Q \cap M_{i+1}$ such that $r \le p_i$ and for $j \in [i_0, i), p_i$ is an upper bound of $\bar q^j$. Then the INC player chooses $\alpha_i < \delta_i$ and $\bar q' = \langle q^i_\alpha : \alpha < \delta_i, \alpha \ge \alpha_i\rangle$ such that $p_i \le p^i_{\alpha_i}$ and $\bar q^i$ is generic for $\bar N^i$ and $\bigwedge\limits_{\alpha \in \delta_i \cap M_{i+1}} \bar q^i \restriction \alpha \in M_{i+1}$.
We may phrase it as one game, where INC chooses $i_0 < \delta$ and $r \in M_{i_0+1} \cap Q$.

2.6 Claim. *Assume $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$ is non-trivial (see 2.1(2)). If $\mathscr{T}$ is a (w,α)-tree, $w \subseteq r = \ell g(\bar Q), |w| < \lambda, \bar Q$ is $(<\kappa)$-support iteration of $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$-complete forcing notions and $\langle p_t : t \in \mathscr{T}\rangle \in TFr(\bar Q), \langle \mathscr{I}_\alpha : \alpha \in w \cup \{\gamma\}\rangle, \mathscr{I}_\alpha \subseteq P_\alpha$ dense, then there is $\langle q_t : t \in \mathscr{T}\rangle \in TFr(\bar Q)$ above $\langle p_t : t \in \mathscr{T}\rangle$ such that $t \in \mathscr{T} \Rightarrow q_t \in \mathscr{I}_{\mathrm{rk}(t)}$.*

Proof. The point is $|\mathscr{T}| < \lambda$, otherwise as in inaccessible case in [Sh 587].

2.7 Claim. *Assume $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_1)$ is non-trivial.*
1) If $\bar Q$ is $(<\kappa)$-support $\Vdash_{P_i}$ "Q_i is $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_1)$-complete", then P_γ is $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_1)$-complete $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_1)$ non-trivial.
2) If Q is $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_1)$-complete, then also in V^Q.

Proof. 1) Like in the inaccessible case ([Sh 587]) with $\bar M, \langle \bar N^i : i < \sigma\rangle$ as in Definition 2.2. We define the trees point: in stage i using trees $\mathscr{T}_i$ with set of levels $w_i = M_i \cap \gamma$ and looking at all possible moves of COM, i.e. $p_i \in M_{i+1} \cap P_\gamma$, so constructing this tree of conditions in δ_i stages, in stage $\varepsilon < \delta_i$, has $|N^i_\varepsilon \cap M_{i+1} \cap Q|^{2^{\|M_i\|}}$ nodes.
Now

$$p \in P_\gamma \cap M_{i+1} \not\Rightarrow \text{ Dom } p \subseteq M_{i+1} \text{ but}$$
$$p \in P_\gamma \cap M_{i+1} \Rightarrow \text{ Dom } p \subseteq M_\sigma = \bigcup_{i<\sigma} N^i_{\delta_i}$$
$$p \in P_\gamma \cap N^i_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \text{ Dom } p \subseteq N^i_{\varepsilon+1}.$$

So in limit cases $i < \sigma$: the existence of limit is by the clause (μ) of Definition 2.2. In the end we use the winning of the play and then need to find a branch in the tree of conditions of level σ: like Case A using $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$. $\square_{2.7}$

2.8 Generalization $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_1$ is a set of triples $\langle \bar{a}, \langle \bar{b}^i : i < \sigma \rangle, \bar{\lambda} \rangle, \bar{a} = \langle a_i : i \le \sigma \rangle$ as before $\bar{b}^i = \langle b^i_\alpha : \alpha \le \delta_i \rangle \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, b^i_{\delta_i} = a_{i+1}, a_i \subseteq b^i_0, \lambda = \langle \lambda_i : i < \sigma \rangle$ an increasing sequence of cardinals $< \lambda, \sum \lambda_i = \lambda$ and $(\bar{M}, \langle \bar{N}^i : i < \sigma \rangle$ obeys $(\bar{a}, \langle \bar{b}^i : i < \bar{\lambda} \rangle$ is $M_i \cap \mu^* = a_i, \bar{N}^i$ obeys $\bar{b}^i$ all things in 2.2 but $\lambda_i \ge \|M_i\|, \lambda_i \ge \prod\limits_{j \le i} \|M_j\|, [N^i_\alpha]^{\lambda_i} \subseteq N^i_{\alpha+1}$ for $\alpha < \delta_i$ (so earlier $\lambda_i = 2^{\|M_i\|}$).

2.9 Conclusion Assume

(a) $S \subseteq \{\delta < \kappa : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \sigma\}$ is stationary not reflecting
(b) $\bar{a} = \langle \bar{a}_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle, \bar{a}_\delta = \langle a_{\delta,i} : i \le \sigma \rangle, \delta = \cup a_{\delta,i}$
[variant note: $\bar{\lambda}^\delta = \langle \lambda^\delta_i : i < \sigma \rangle$ increasing with limit λ]
(c) letting $\mu^* = \kappa, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0 = \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0[S] = \{\bar{a} : a_i \in \kappa \backslash S$ increasing continuous$\}$
$\hat{\mathscr{E}}_1 = \{\bar{a}_\delta : \delta \in S\}$
(or $\{\langle \bar{a}_\delta, \langle \bar{b}^{i,\delta} : i < \delta \rangle, \bar{\lambda}^\delta \rangle : \delta \in S\}$ appropriate for (2.8).
We assume the pair $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_1)$ is not trivial
(d) $\mu = \mu^\kappa, \kappa < \tau = \mathrm{cf}(\tau) < \mu$.

Then for some $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_1)$-complete P of cardinality μ

$\Vdash_P$ "forcing axioms for $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_1)$-complete forcing notion
of cardinality $\le \kappa$ and $< \tau$ of open dense sets" and S is still
stationary (by preservation of $(\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_1)$-nontrivial.

Proof. As in the inaccessible case.
In particular the κ^+-c.c. lemma work.

2.10 Application: In V^P of 2.9:

(a) if $\theta < \lambda, A_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(A_\delta)$ for $\delta \in S, |A_\delta| \le \theta, (\forall^* i < \sigma)[a_\delta \cap \sup a_{\delta,i} \subseteq a_{\delta,i}], \bar{h} = \langle h_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle, h_\delta : A \to \theta$, then for some $h : \kappa \to \theta$, for some club E of $\kappa, (\forall \delta \in S \cap E)[h_\delta \subseteq^* h]$ bounded set of errors where $h' \subseteq^* h''$ means $\sup(\text{Dom } h') > \sup\{\alpha_i, \alpha \in \text{ Dom } h'$ and $\alpha \notin \text{ Dom}(h'')$ or
$\alpha \in \text{ Dom}(h'') \ \& \ h'(\alpha) \ne h''(\alpha)\}$
(b) if we add: "h_δ constant", then we can omit the assumption
$(\forall^* i < \sigma)(A_\delta \cap \sup a_{\delta,i} \subseteq a_{\delta,i})$

- (c) we can weaken $|A_\delta| < \theta$ to $|A_\delta \cap a_{\delta,i+1}| \le |a_{\delta,i}|$
- (d) in (c) we can weaken $|A_\delta| < \theta \vee |A_\delta \cap a_{\delta,i+1}| \le |a_{\delta,i}|$ to $h_\delta \restriction a_{\delta,i+1}$ belongs to $M_{i+1} \cap N^i_\alpha$ for some $\alpha < \delta_i$
(remember cf(sup $a_{\delta,i+1}) > \lambda^\delta_i$).

2.11 Remark. 1) Compared to [Sh 186] the new point is (b).
2) You may complain why not having the best of (a) + (b), i.e. combine their good points. The reason is that this is impossible by §1, §4 (c), (d) - similar situation in the inaccessible.

Proof. Should be clear. Still we say something in case h_δ constant (b).
Let

$$\begin{aligned} Q = \{(h,C) :&\alpha =: \text{ Dom}(h) < \kappa = \lambda^+, \\ &C \text{ a closed subset of } \alpha+1, \alpha \in C \\ &(\forall \delta \in C \cap S)(h_\delta \subseteq^* h)\}. \end{aligned}$$

So
Fact: $(h,C) \in Q, \alpha = \text{ Dom}(h) < \beta \in \kappa \backslash S, \gamma < \theta \Rightarrow (h,C) \le (h \cup \gamma_{[\alpha,\beta]}, C \cup \{\beta\}) \in Q$.
In the game from 2.2, we can even prove that the player COM has a winning strategy: in stage i (non-trivial): if h_δ is constantly $\gamma < \theta$ or just $h_\delta \restriction (A_\delta \cap a_{\delta,i+1} \backslash a_{\delta,i})$ is constantly $\gamma < \theta$ then we let

$$\begin{aligned} p_i = \Big(\bigcup_{\substack{j<i \\ \zeta<\delta_i}} \text{ the function } q^j_\zeta) \cup \gamma_{[\text{Dom } \bigcup\limits_{\substack{j<i \\ \zeta<\delta}} q^j_\zeta, \beta_i)}, \\ \text{closure}\big(\bigcup_{\substack{j<i \\ \zeta<\delta_i}} (\text{club of } q^j_\zeta) \cup \{\beta\}) \Big) \end{aligned}$$

for $\beta \in M_{i+1} \cap \kappa \backslash M_i$ large enough such that $A_\delta \cap M_{i+1} \cap \kappa \subseteq \beta$.

Remark. In the example of uniformizing (see [Sh 587]) if we use this forcing, the density is less problematic.

2.12 Claim. *In 2.10's conclusion we can omit the club E and demand $(\forall \delta \in S)(h_\delta \subseteq^* h)$ provided that we add in 2.9 (recalling $S \subseteq \kappa$ does not reflect) is a set of limits and*

$$\bar A = \langle A_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle, A_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(A_\delta)$$

satisfies

- $(*)$ $\delta_1 \ne \delta_2$ *in* $S \Rightarrow \sup(A_{\delta_i} \cap A_\delta) < \delta_1 \cap \delta_2$.

(If $(\forall\delta \in S)(cf(\delta) = \theta)$ *&* $\bigwedge_\delta otp(A_\delta) = \theta$ *this always holds.*

Proof. We define $Q = \{h : \alpha = \text{Dom}(h) < \kappa, \text{ Rang } h \subseteq \bigcup_{\delta\in S} \text{Rang } h_\delta\}$ ordered by $\subseteq$. Now we can have the parallel of the fact that: if $p : \alpha \to$ (set of colours), $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$.
We can find $\langle A'_\delta : \delta \in S \cap (\alpha+1)\rangle$ such that $A'_\delta \subseteq A_\delta, \sup(A^*_\delta \backslash A'_\delta) < \delta$,
$\bar{A}' = \langle A'_\delta : \delta \in S \cap (\alpha+1)\rangle$ pairwise disjoint.

Now choose q as follows

$$\text{Dom}(q) = \beta$$

$$q(j) = \begin{cases} p(j) & \underline{\text{if}} \quad j < \alpha \\ h_\delta(j) & \underline{\text{if}} \quad j \in A'_\delta \backslash \alpha, \delta \in S \cap (\beta+1) \backslash (\alpha+1) \\ 0 & \underline{\text{if}} \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Why does $\bar{A}'$ exist? Prove by induction on β that any $\langle A'_\delta : \delta \in S \cap (\alpha+1)\rangle, \alpha < \beta$, can we end extending to $\langle A'_\delta : \delta \in S \cap (\beta+1)\rangle$.

2.13 Remark. Note: concerning κ inaccessible we could immitate what is here: having $M_{i+1} \underset{\neq}{\prec} N^i_{\delta_i}, \bigcup_{i<\delta} M_i = \bigcup_{i<\delta} N^i_{\delta_i}$.

As long as we are looking for a proof no sequence of length $< \kappa$ are added, the gain is meagre (restricting the $\bar{q}$'s by $\bar{q} \restriction \alpha \in N'_{\alpha+1}$). Still if you want to make the uniformization and some diamond may consider.

2.14 Comment: We can weaken further the demand, by letting COM have more influence. E.g. we have (in 2.2) $\delta_i = \lambda_i = \text{cf}(\lambda_i) = \|M_{i+1}\|, D_i$ a $|a_i|^+$-complete filter on λ_i, the choice of $\bar{q}^i$ in the result of a game in which INC should have chose a set of player $\in D_i$ and $\diamondsuit_{D_i}$ holds (as in the treatment of case E^* here). More details?

The changes are obvious, but I do not see an application at the moment.

2.15 Claim. *In 2.10(9) we get:*

(∗) *if for* $\delta \in S, A_\delta \subseteq \delta, |A_\delta| < \lambda$ *then for some club* E *of* κ *we have*
$\delta \in E \cap S \Rightarrow otp(A_\delta \cap E) \leq \sigma$.

Proof. Straight.

§3 κ^+-C.C. AND κ^+-PIC

We intend to generalize pic of [Sh:f, Ch.VIII,§1]. The intended use is for iteration with each forcing $> \kappa$ - see use in [Sh:f]. (At present we need each Q_i of cardinality $\le \kappa$. Usually $\mu = \kappa^+$.)

3.1 Definition. Assume:

- (a) $\mu = \text{ cf}(\mu) > |\alpha|^{<\kappa}$ for $\alpha < \mu$
- (b) $(\kappa, \mu^*, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0)$ as usual in [Sh 587] that is $\kappa = \text{ cf}(\kappa) > \aleph_0, \mu^* \ge \kappa, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0 \subseteq \{\bar a : \bar a$ an increasing continuous sequence of members of $[\mu^*]^{<\kappa}$ of limit length $< \kappa\}$ and
- (c) $S^\square \subseteq \{\delta < \mu : \text{cf}(\delta) \ge \kappa\}$ stationary.

We say Q satisfies $(\mu, S^\square, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0)$-pic if: for some $x \in \mathscr{H}(\chi)$ (can be omitted, essentially)

- $(*)$ if $\langle \mu, S^0, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, x\rangle \in N^\alpha_0$ for $\alpha \in S^\square, \bar N^\alpha = \langle \bar N^\alpha_i : i \le \delta_\alpha\rangle$ obeys $\bar a^\alpha \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$ (with some error n) (so here we have $\|N^\alpha_{\delta_\alpha}\| < \kappa, \delta_\alpha < \kappa$) and $\bar p^\alpha$ is generic for $\bar N^\alpha$ and for every i, if $\alpha \in S^\square, i < \delta_\alpha$ then $\langle(\bar N^\beta \restriction (i+1), \bar p^\beta \restriction (i+1)) : \beta \in S^\square\rangle$ belongs to N^α_{i+1} and we define a function g with domain $S^\square, g(\alpha) = (g_0(\alpha), g_1(\alpha)), g_0(\alpha) = N^\alpha_{\delta_\alpha} \cap (\bigcup\limits_{\beta<\alpha} N^\beta_{\delta_\beta}), g_1(\alpha) = (N^\alpha_{\delta_1}, N^\alpha_i, c)_{i<\delta_1, c \in g_0(\alpha)}/\cong$,
  then we can find a club C of μ and a regressive function $g : C \cap S \to \mu$ such that:
  if $\alpha < \beta \;\; \& \;\; g(\alpha) = g(\beta) \;\; \& \;\; \alpha \in C \cap S \;\; \& \;\; \beta \in C \cap S$ then for some $h, N^\alpha_{\delta_\alpha} \underset{h}{\cong} N^\beta_{h_\alpha}$ (really unique), h maps N^α_i to N^β_i, p^α_i to p^β_i and $\{p^\alpha_i : i < \delta_\alpha\} \cup \{p^\beta_i : i < \delta_\beta\}$ has an upper bound.

3.2 Claim. *Assume (a),(b) of 3.1 and*

- (c) *$\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$ is non-trivial, that is for every α large enough and $x \in \mathscr{H}(\chi)$ there is $\bar N = \langle N_i : i \le \delta\rangle$ increasingly continuous, $N_i \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in), x \in N_i, \|N_i\| < \kappa, \bar N \restriction (i+1) \in N_{i+1}$ and $\bar N$ obeys some $\bar a \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$ with some finite error n)*
- (d) *Q is an $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$-complete forcing notion not adding bounded subsets of κ and Q satisfies $(\mu, S^\square, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0)$-pic.*

Then Q satisfies the μ-c.c. (and for every $x \in \mathscr{H}(\chi), \chi$ large enough, $p \in Q$ for some $\bar N$ as in clause (c), $\langle Q, p, s\rangle \in N_0$ and for some increasing sequence $\bar p = \langle p_i : i \le \ell g(\bar N)\rangle$ of members of $Q, \bar p$ is generic for $\bar N$ and $p \le p_0$).

Proof. Straight.

3.3 Claim. *If Definition 3.1, we can allow Dom(g) to be a subset of* $\lambda, \langle A_i : i < \mu\rangle$ *be an increasingly continuous sequence of sets,* $|A_i| < \mu, N^\alpha_{\delta_\alpha} \subseteq A_{\alpha+1}$ *replacing the definition of g by* $g_0(\alpha) = N^\alpha_{\delta_\alpha} \cap A_\alpha, g_i(\alpha) = (N^\alpha_{\delta_\alpha}, N^\alpha_i, c)_{i<\delta_\alpha, c\in g_0(c)}/\cong$ *(and get equivalent definition).*

Remark. If $\mathrm{Dom}(g) \cap S^\square$ is not stationary, the definition says nothing.

Proof. Straight.

3.4 Claim. *Assume clauses (a), (b) of 3.1 and (c) of 3.2.*

For $(<\kappa)$*-support iteration* $\bar{Q}$ *if we have* $\Vdash_{P_i}$ *"*$\underset{\sim}{Q}_i$ *is* $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$*-complete*[1], $(\mu, S^\square, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0)$*-pic" and forcing with Lim*$(\bar{Q})$ *add no bounded subsets of* κ, *then* P_γ *and* P_γ/P_β, *for* $\beta \le \gamma \le \ell g(\bar{Q})$ *are* $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$*-complete* $(\mu, S^\square, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0)$*-pic.*

Proof. Similar to [Sh:f, Ch.VIII].

We prove this by induction. Let $\Vdash_{P_i}$ "$\underset{\sim}{Q}_i$ is $(\mu, S^\square, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0)$-pic as witnessed by $\underset{\sim}{x}_i$ and let $\underset{\sim}{\chi}_i = \operatorname{Min}\{\chi : \underset{\sim}{x}_i \in \mathscr{H}(\chi)\}$".

Let $x = (\mu^*, \kappa, \mu, S^\square, \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0, \langle(\underset{\sim}{\chi}_i, \underset{\sim}{x}_i) : i < \ell g(\bar{Q})\rangle)$ and assume χ is large enough such that $x \in \mathscr{H}(\chi)$ and let $\langle(\bar{N}^\alpha, \bar{p}^\alpha) : \alpha \in S^\square\rangle$ be as in Definition 3.1, $\bar{N}^\alpha = \langle N^\alpha_i : i \le \delta_\alpha\rangle$. We define a h, C such that

$\boxtimes_1$ C is a club of μ, g is a function with domain $S^\square$
$g(\alpha) = \langle g_\ell(\alpha) : \ell < 2\rangle$
$g_0(\alpha) = (N^\alpha_{\delta_\alpha}) \cap (\bigcup\limits_{\beta<\alpha} N^\beta_{\delta_\beta})$
$g_1(\alpha) =$ the isomorphic type of $(N^\beta_{\delta_\beta}, N^\beta_i, p^\beta_i, c)_{c\in h_1(\alpha)}$

$\boxtimes_2$ $C = \{\delta < \mu :$ if $\alpha \in [\delta, \mu), h_0(\alpha) \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{\beta<\delta} N^\beta_{\delta_\alpha}$ then for some $\alpha' < \delta, h(\alpha') = h(\alpha)\}$.

Fix y such that $S_y = \{\alpha \in S^\square : g(\alpha) = y$ and $\alpha \in C\}$ is stationary.

Let $w_\alpha = \bigcup\limits_{i<\delta_\alpha} \mathrm{Dom}(p^\alpha_i), w^* = w_\alpha \cap g_0(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in S_y$ (the set does not depend on the α). For each $\zeta \in w^*_y$ we define a P_ζ-name, $\underset{\sim}{S}_{y,\zeta}$ as follows:

$$\underset{\sim}{S}_{y,\zeta} = \{\alpha \in S_y : (\forall i < \delta_\alpha)(p^\alpha_i \in \underset{\sim}{G}_{P_\zeta})\}.$$

Now apply Definition 3.1 in V^{P_ζ} to $\Big\langle(\langle N^\alpha_i[\underset{\sim}{G}_{P_\zeta}] : i \le \delta_\alpha\rangle, \langle p^\alpha_i(\zeta)[\underset{\sim}{G}_{P_\zeta}] : c < \delta_\alpha\rangle) : \alpha \in \underset{\sim}{S}_{y,\zeta}\Big\rangle$. Now $\underset{\sim}{g}_{y,\zeta}$ is well defined, and actually can be computed if we use $A_\beta = \cup\{N^\alpha_{\delta_\alpha}[\underset{\sim}{G}_{P_\zeta}] : \alpha < \beta\}$. So by an assumption there is a suitable P_ζ-name $\underset{\sim}{C}_\zeta$ of a club of μ. But as P_ζ satisfies the μ-c.c. without loss of generality $\underset{\sim}{C}_\zeta = C_\zeta$ so without loss of generality $C \subseteq \bigcap\limits_{\zeta \in w^*_y} C_\zeta$. Now choose $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ from $S_y \cap C$ and we choose by induction on $\varepsilon \in w' = w^*_y \cup \{0, \ell g(\bar{Q})\}$ a condition $q_\varepsilon \in P_\varepsilon$ such that:

---

[1] this includes the facts of initial segments of $\bar{a} \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$

$$\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon \Rightarrow q_{\varepsilon_1} = q_\varepsilon \restriction \varepsilon_1$$

$$q_\varepsilon \text{ is a bound to } \{p^{\alpha_1}_u \restriction \varepsilon : i < \delta_{\alpha_1}\} \cup \{p^{\alpha_2}_i \restriction \varepsilon : i < \delta_{\alpha_2}\}.$$

For $\varepsilon = 0$ let $q_0 = \emptyset$, we have nothing to do really if ε is with no immediate predecessor in w, actually have nothing to do q_ε is $\cup\{q_{\varepsilon_1} : \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon, \varepsilon_2 \in w'\}$. So let $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1 + 1, \varepsilon_1 \in w'$ and we use Definition 3.1. $\square_{3.4}$

3.5 Comment on 3.4: 1) There is ambiguity: $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$ is as in the accessible case, but this part works in the other cases. In particular, in Case A,B (in [Sh 587]'s context) if the length of $\bar{a} \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$ is $< \lambda$ (remember $\kappa = \lambda^+$), then we have $(< \lambda)$-completeness implies $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_0$-completeness AND in 3.4 even $\bar{a} \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_0 \Rightarrow \ell g(\bar{a}) = \omega$ is O.K.

In Case A on the $S_0 \subseteq S^\kappa_\lambda$ if $\ell g(\bar{a}) = \lambda, a_\lambda \in S_0$ is O.K., too. STILL can start with other variants of completeness which is preserved.

3.6 Claim. *If* $|Q| \leq \kappa, \mathscr{E}_0 \subseteq \{\bar{a} : \bar{a}$ *increasingly continuous* $a_i \in [\mu^\kappa] < \kappa\}$ *non-trivial possibly just for one cofinality say* $\aleph_0$*, then* Q *satisfies* κ^+*-pic.*

Proof. Trivial. We get same sequence of condition.

3.7 Discussion: 1) What is the use of pic?

In the forcing axioms instead "$|Q| \leq \kappa$" we can write "Q satisfies the κ^+-pic". This strengthens the axioms.

In [Sh:f] in some cases the length of the forcing is bounded (there ω_2) but here no need (as in [Sh:f, Ch.VII,§1]).

This section applies to all cases in [Sh 587] and its branches.

2) Note that we can demand that the P^α_i satisfies some additional requirements (in Definition 3.1) say $p^\alpha_{2i} = F_Q(\bar{N} \restriction (2i+1), \bar{p}^\alpha \restriction (2i+1))$.

§4 Existence of non-free Whitehead (and $\mathrm{Ext}(G,\mathbb{Z}) = \{0\}$) abelian groups in successor of singulars

4.1 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) *λ is strong limit singular, $\sigma =$ cf$(\lambda) < \lambda, \kappa = \lambda^+ = 2^\lambda$*
- (b) *$S \subseteq \{\delta < \kappa : cf(\delta) = \sigma\}$ is stationary*
- (c) *S does not reflect or at least*
- $(c)^-$ *$\bar A = \langle A_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$, $otp(A_\delta) = \sigma, \sup(A_\delta) = \delta$,*
  $\bar A$ is λ-free, i.e. for every $\alpha^* < \kappa$ we can find $\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \in \alpha^* \cap S\rangle, \alpha_\delta < \delta$ such that $\langle A_\delta \backslash \alpha_\delta : \delta \in S \cap \alpha^*\rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint sets
- (d) *$\langle G_i : i \le \sigma\rangle$ is a sequence of abelian groups such that:*

$$\delta < \sigma \text{ limit } \Rightarrow G_\delta = \bigcup_{i<\delta} G_i$$

$$i < j \le \sigma \Rightarrow G_j/G_i \text{ free } \ \& \ G_i \subseteq G_j$$

- (e) *$G_\sigma / \bigcup\limits_{i<\sigma} G_i$ is not Whitehead*

$$|G| < \lambda$$

$$\text{and } G_0 = \{0\}.$$

Then
1) There is a strongly κ-free abelian group of cardinality κ which is not Whitehead, in fact $\Gamma(G) \subseteq S$.
2) There is a strongly κ-free abelian group G^* of cardinality κ, HOM$(G^*,\mathbb{Z}) = \{0\}$, in fact $\Gamma(G) \subseteq S$ (in fact the same abelian group can serve).

Remark. We can replace "not Whitehead" by: some $f \in$ HOM$(\bigcup\limits_{i<\sigma} G_i, \mathbb{Z})$ cannot be extended to $f' \in$ HOM$(G_\sigma, \mathbb{Z})$. This is used in part (2) which actually implies part (1).

We first note:

4.2 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) *λ strong limit singular, $\sigma =$ cf$(\lambda) < \lambda, \kappa = 2^\lambda = \lambda^+$*
- (b) *$S \subseteq \{\delta < \kappa : cf(\delta) = \sigma$ and λ^ω divides δ for simplicity$\}$ is stationary*
- (c) *$A_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(A_\delta)$, $otp(A_\delta) = \sigma, A_\delta = \{\alpha_{\delta,\zeta} : \zeta < \sigma\}$ increasing with ζ*
- (d) *$h_0 : \kappa \to \kappa$ and $h_1 : \kappa \to \sigma$ be such that*
  $(\forall \alpha < \kappa)(\forall \zeta < \sigma)(\forall \gamma \in (\alpha, \kappa))(\exists^\lambda \beta \in [\gamma, \gamma + \lambda])(h_0(\beta) = \alpha \ \& \ h_1(\beta) = \zeta)$,
  $(\forall \alpha < \kappa) h_0(\alpha) \le \alpha$
- (e) *Let $\lambda = \langle \lambda_\zeta : \zeta < \sigma\rangle$ increasingly continuous with limit $\lambda, \lambda_0 = 0$.*

Then we can choose $\langle (g_\delta, \langle \beta^\delta_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda\rangle) : \delta \in S\rangle$ *such that*

- $\bigodot_1$ $\langle \beta^\delta_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda\rangle$ *is strictly increasing with limit* δ
- $\bigodot_2$ *for every* $g : \kappa \to \kappa, B \in [\kappa]^{<\lambda}, g^2_\zeta : \kappa \to \lambda_{\zeta+1}$ *for* $\zeta < \sigma$ *there are stationarily many* $\delta \in S$ *such that:*
  - (i) $g_\delta = g \restriction B$
  - (ii) *if* $\bigcup\limits_{\xi<\zeta} \lambda_\varepsilon \le \xi < \lambda_\zeta$ *then* $h_0(\beta^\delta_\xi) = h_0(\beta^\delta_{\lambda_\zeta}) = \alpha_{\delta,\zeta}, h_1(\beta^\delta_\xi) = h_1(\beta^\delta_{\lambda_\zeta}) = \zeta, g^2_\zeta(\beta^\delta_\xi) = g^2_\zeta(\beta^\delta_{\lambda_\zeta})$.

Remark. Note that subtraction is meaningful, $(*)$ is quite strong.

Proof. By the proofs of 1.1, 1.2 (can use guessing clubs by $\alpha_{\delta,\zeta}$'s, can demand that $\beta^\delta_{2\zeta}, \beta^\delta_{2\zeta+1} \in [\alpha_{\delta,\zeta}, \alpha_{\delta,\zeta} + \lambda)$.

For making the section selfcontained, we give a proof; note that this will prove 1.2, too. Let $\mathscr{H}(\kappa) = \bigcup\limits_{\alpha<\kappa} M_\alpha, M_\alpha$ is $\prec$-increasingly continuous, $\|M_\lambda\| = \lambda, \langle M_\beta : \beta \le \alpha\rangle \in M_{\alpha+1}, {}^{\sigma>}(M_{\alpha+1}) \subseteq M_{\alpha+1}$. Let $\lambda = \sum\limits_{i<\sigma} \lambda_i, \lambda_i$ increasingly continuous, $\lambda_{i+1} > 2^{\lambda_i}, \lambda_0 = 0, \lambda_1 > 2^\sigma$. Let $F_i : [\kappa]^{\lambda_i} \to [\kappa]^\kappa$ for $i < \sigma$ (this towards $(*)_2$ of 1.2). For $\alpha < \lambda^+$, let $\alpha = \bigcup\limits_{i<\sigma} a_{\alpha,i}$ such that $|a_{\alpha,i}| \le \lambda_i$ and $a_{\alpha,i} \in M_{\alpha+1}$. Without loss of generality $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \delta$ divisible by λ^ω (ordinal exponentiation). For $\delta \in S$ let $\langle \beta^\delta_i : i < \sigma\rangle$ be increasingly continuous with limit δ, β^δ_i divisible by λ and > 0. For $\delta \in S$ let $\langle b^\delta_i : i < \sigma\rangle$ be such that: $b^\delta_i \subseteq \beta^\delta_i, |b^\delta_i| \le \lambda_i, b^\delta_i$ is increasingly continuous in i and $\delta = \bigcup\limits_{i<\sigma} b^\delta_i$ (e.g. $b^\delta_i = \bigcup\limits_{j_1,j_2<i} a_{\beta^\delta_{j_1,j_2}} \cup \lambda_i$). We further demand $\beta^\delta_i \ge \lambda \Rightarrow \lambda_i \subseteq b^\delta_i \cap \lambda$. Let $\langle f^*_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$ list the two-place functions with domain an ordinal $< \lambda^+$ and range $\subseteq \lambda^+$. Let H be the set of functions h, $\mathrm{Dom}(h) \in [\kappa]^{<\lambda}$, $\mathrm{Rang}(h) \subseteq \kappa$, so $|H| = \kappa$. Let $S = \cup\{S_h : h \in H\}$, with each S_h stationary and $\langle S_h : h \in H\rangle$ pairwise disjoint. We now fix $h \in H$ and will choose $\bar\gamma^\delta = \langle \gamma^\delta_i : i < \lambda\rangle$ for $\delta \in S_h$ such that clauses $\bigodot_1 + \bigodot_2$ for our fix h (and $\delta \in S_h$) hold, this clearly suffices.

Now for $\delta \in S_h$ and $i < \sigma$ and $g \in {}^{i+1}\sigma$ we can choose $\zeta^\delta_{i,g,\varepsilon}$ (for $\varepsilon < \lambda_{i+1}$) such that:

- (A) $\langle \zeta^\delta_{i,g,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda_i\rangle$ is a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals
- (B) $\beta^\delta_i < \zeta^\delta_{i,g,\varepsilon} < \beta^\delta_{i+1}$, (can even demand $\zeta^\delta_{i,j,\varepsilon} < \beta^\delta_i + \lambda$)
- (C) if $(\beta^\delta_i, \beta^\delta_{i+1}) \cap F_i\{\zeta^\delta_{j,g\restriction(j+1),\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda_j$ and $j < i\}$ has cardinality λ then $\zeta^\delta_{i,g,\varepsilon}$ belongs to it
- (D) for every $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in b^\delta_j$, the sequence $\langle \mathrm{Min}\{\lambda_{g(i)}, f^*_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2, \zeta^\delta_{i,g,\varepsilon}) : \varepsilon < \lambda_{i+1}\}\rangle$ is constant i.e.: either

$$\varepsilon < \lambda_{i+1} \Rightarrow (\alpha_2, \zeta^\delta_{i,g,\varepsilon}) \notin \mathrm{Dom}(f^*_{\alpha_1})$$

$$\underline{\text{or}} \bigwedge_{\varepsilon<\lambda_{i+1}} f^*_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2,\zeta^\delta_{i,g,\varepsilon}) = f^*_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2,\zeta^\delta_{i,j,0})$$

$$\underline{\text{or}} \bigwedge_{\varepsilon<\lambda_j} f^*_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2,\zeta^\delta_{i,g,\varepsilon}) \geq \lambda_j.$$

We can add $\langle f^*_{\alpha_1}(\alpha_2,\zeta^\delta_{i,g,\varepsilon}) : \varepsilon < \lambda_i\rangle$ is constant or strictly increasing (or all undefined).

- (E) for some $j < \sigma, \{\varepsilon < \lambda_{i+1} : \gamma^\delta_{i,g,\varepsilon} \in a_{\alpha,j}\}$ where
  $\alpha = \sup\{\gamma^\delta_{i,g,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda_{i+1}\}$, (remember $\sigma \neq \lambda_{i+1}$ are regular).

For each function $g \in {}^\sigma\sigma$ we try $\bar\gamma^{g,\delta} = \langle \gamma^{\delta,g}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda\rangle$ be: if $\lambda_i \leq \varepsilon < \lambda_{i+1}$ then $\gamma^{\delta,g}_\alpha = \gamma^\delta_{i,g,\varepsilon}$.
Now for some g it works. $\square_{4.2}$

Proof of 4.1. 1) We apply 4.2 to the $\langle A_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ from 4.1, and any reasonable h_0, h_1.
Let $\{t^{i,j}_\gamma + G_i : \gamma < \theta^{i,j}\}$ be a free basis of G^j/G^i for $i < j \leq \sigma$. If $i = 0, j = \sigma$ we may omit the i, j, i.e. $t_\zeta = t^{0,\sigma}_\zeta$. Let $\theta + \aleph_0 = |G| < a\lambda$ actually $\theta^{\zeta,\zeta+1} < \lambda_\zeta$ is enough, without loss of generality $\theta < \lambda_1$ in 4.2. Let $\beta^\delta_{\zeta,i} = \beta^\delta_{\xi(\zeta,i)}$ where $\xi(\zeta,i) = \bigcup\limits_{\varepsilon<\zeta} \lambda_\varepsilon + 1 + i$ for $\delta \in S, \zeta < \sigma, i < \theta$.
Let $\beta_\delta(*) =$ Min$\{\beta : \beta \in$ Dom$(g_\delta), g_\delta(\beta) \neq 0\}$, if well defined where g_δ is from 4.2.
Without loss of generality $\beta_\delta(*) \notin \{\beta^\delta_{\zeta,i} : \zeta < \sigma, i < \theta\}$ (or omit $\lambda_\zeta, \beta^\delta_{\zeta,i}$ for ζ too small). We define an abelian group G^*: it is generated by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \cup \{y^\delta_\gamma : \gamma < \theta^{0,\sigma}$ and $\delta \in S\}$ freely except the relations:

$$(*) \quad \sum_{\gamma<\theta^{0,\sigma}} a_\gamma y^\delta_\gamma = \sum\{b_{\zeta,\gamma}(x_{\beta^\delta_{\zeta,\gamma}} - x_{\beta^\delta_{\lambda_\zeta}}) : \zeta < \sigma \text{ and } \gamma < \theta^{\zeta,\zeta+1}\}$$

when $G \models \sum\limits_{j<\theta} a_\gamma t_\gamma = \sum\{b_{\zeta,\gamma} t^{\zeta,\zeta+1}_\gamma, \zeta < \sigma \text{ and } \gamma < \theta^{\zeta,\zeta+1}\}$ where
$a_\gamma, b_{\zeta,\gamma} \in \mathbb{Z}$ but all except finitely many are zero.

There is a (unique) homomorphism $\mathbf{g}_\delta$ of G into H induced by $\mathbf{g}_\delta(t_\gamma) = g^\delta_\gamma$. As usual it is an embedding. Let Rang $\mathbf{g}_\delta = G^{<\delta>}$.
For $\alpha < \kappa$ let G^*_β be the subgroup of G^* generated by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\} \cup \{y^\delta_\gamma : \gamma < \theta^{0,\sigma}$ and $\delta \in \beta \cap S\}$. It can be described like G^*.

Fact A: G^* is strongly λ-free.

Proof. For $\alpha^* < \beta^* < \kappa$, we can find $\langle \alpha_\delta : \delta \in S \cap (\alpha^*, \beta^*]\rangle$ such that $\langle A_\delta \backslash \alpha_\delta : \delta \in S \cap (\alpha^*, \beta^*)\rangle$ are pairwise disjoint hence the sequence $\langle\{\beta^\delta_{\zeta,i} : i < \theta, \zeta \in (\text{Min}\{\xi < \sigma : \beta^\delta_{\zeta,0} > \alpha_\delta\}, \sigma)\} : \delta \in S \cap (\alpha^*, \beta^*]\rangle$ in a sequence of pairwise disjoint sets.
Let $\zeta_\delta =$ Min$\{\zeta : \beta^\delta_{\zeta,0} > \alpha_\delta\} < \sigma$. Now $G^*_{\beta^*+1}$ is generated as an extension of

$G^*_{\alpha^*+1}$ by $\{\mathbf{g}_\delta(t^{\zeta_\delta,\sigma}_\gamma) : \gamma < \theta^{\zeta_\delta,\sigma}$ and $\delta \in S \cap (\alpha^*, \beta^*)\} \cup \{x_\alpha : \alpha \in (\alpha^*, \beta^*]$ and for no $\delta \in S \cap (\alpha^*, \beta^*]$ do we have $\alpha \in \{\beta^\delta_{\zeta,i} : i < \theta^{\zeta,\sigma}$ and $\zeta < \zeta_\delta\}\}$; moreover $G^*_{\beta^*+1}$ is freely generated (as an extension of $G^*_{\alpha^*+1}$). So $G^*_{\beta^*+1}/G^*_{\alpha^*+1}$ is free, as also $G^*_{\theta+1}$ is free we have shown Fact A.

Fact B: G^* is not Whitehead.

Proof. We choose by induction on $\alpha \le \kappa$, an abelian group H_α and a homomorphism $\mathbf{h}_\alpha : H_\alpha \to G^*_\alpha = \langle\{x_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \cup \{y^\delta_\gamma : \gamma < \theta, \delta \in S \cap \alpha\}\rangle_{G^*}$ increasingly continuous in α, with kernel $\mathbb{Z}, \mathbf{h}_0 =$ zero and $\mathbf{k}_\alpha : G^*_\alpha \to H_\alpha$ not necessarily linear such that $\mathbf{h}_\alpha \circ \mathbf{k}_\alpha = \text{id}_{G^*_\alpha}$. We identify the set of members of $H_\alpha, G_\alpha, \mathbb{Z}$ with subsets of $\lambda \times (1 + \alpha)$ such that $O_{H_\alpha} = O_{\mathbb{Z}} = 0$.
Usually we have no freedom or no interesting freedom. But we have for $\alpha = \delta + 1$, $\delta \in S$. What we demand is ($G^{\langle\delta\rangle}$ - see before Fact A):

(∗) letting $H^{<\delta>} = \{x \in H_{\delta+1} : \mathbf{h}_{\delta+1}(x) \in G^{<\delta>}\}$, if $s^* = g_\delta(x_{\beta_\delta(*)}) \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$ (g_δ from 4.2(*)), then there is no homomorphism $f_\delta : G^{<\delta>} \to H^{<\delta>}$ such that

   (α) $f_\delta(x_{\beta^\delta_{\zeta,i}}) - \mathbf{k}_\delta(x_{\beta^\delta_{\zeta,i}}) \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the same for all $i \in (\bigcup\limits_{\varepsilon<\zeta} \lambda_\varepsilon, \lambda_\zeta]$

   (β) $\mathbf{h}_{\delta+1} \circ f_\delta = \text{id}_{G^{<\delta>}}$.

[Why is this possible? By non-Whiteheadness of $G^\sigma / \bigcup\limits_{i<\sigma} G^i$.]
The rest should be clear.

Proof of 4.1(2). Of course, similar to that of 4.1(1) but with some changes.

Step A: Without loss of generality there is a homomorphism g^* from $\bigcup\limits_{i<\sigma} G^i$ to $\mathbb{Z}$ which cannot be extended to a homormopshim from G^σ to $\mathbb{Z}$.
[Why? Standard.]

Step B: During the construction of G^*, we choose G^*_α by induction on $\alpha \le \kappa$, but if $g_\delta(0)$ from 4.2 is a member of G^*_δ in (∗) we replace $(x_{\beta^\delta_{\zeta,\gamma}} - x_{\beta^\delta_{\lambda_\zeta}})$ by $\big(x_{\beta^\delta_{\lambda_\zeta+1+\gamma}} - x_{\beta^\delta_{\lambda_\zeta}} + g^*(t^{\zeta,\zeta+1}_\gamma) \times g_\delta(0)\big)$.
So if in the end $f : G^* \to \mathbb{Z}$ is a non-zero homomorphism, let $x^* \in G^*$ be such that $f(x^*) \neq 0$ and $|f^*(x^*)|$ is minimal under this, so without loss of generality it is 1. So for some δ

$$f(g_\delta(0)) = 1_{\mathbb{Z}}$$

$$f(x_{\beta^\delta_{\lambda_\zeta+1+1+\gamma}}) = f(x_{\beta^\delta_{\lambda_\zeta}}) \text{ for } \gamma < \lambda_{\zeta+1} - \lambda_\zeta$$

(in fact for stationarily many).

So we get an easy contradiction. $\square_{4.1}$

4.3 Comment: Assume

$\bigotimes_0$ λ is strong limit singular, $\kappa = 2^\lambda = \lambda^+$ and $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda) = \sigma$.

Assume

$\bigotimes_1$ G is strongly κ-free not free of cardinality κ.

Then we can apply the analysis of [Sh 161] (or see [Sh 521]). So we have a κ-system $\mathscr{S}$ and $\langle a^\ell_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{S}_f, \ell < n(\mathscr{S})\rangle, a^\ell_\eta$ countable sets as there.

Let $\langle G_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ be a filtration of G so G_i increases continuously, G_i a pure subgroup of $G, |G_i| < \kappa, G = \bigcup\limits_{i<\kappa} G_i$, and for each $i, (\exists j > i)(G_j/G_i$ non-free$) \rightarrow G_{i+1}/G_i$ non-free and $(\exists j > i)(G_j/G_i$ not Whitehead $\rightarrow G_{i+1}/G_i$ not Whitehead$)$. Now

$(*)_1$ if G is Whitehead, then $S_0 = \{\delta < \lambda^+ : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) \neq \sigma, G_{\delta+1}/G_\delta$ not Whitehead$\}$ is not stationary (otherwise by $\diamondsuit_{S_0}$ we are done).

Assume further

$\bigotimes_2$ G is Whitehead.

Together

$(*)_2$ without loss of generality $\Gamma'(G) = \{\delta < \lambda^+ : G_{\delta+1}/G_\delta$ not Whitehead$\} \subseteq \{\delta < \kappa : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \sigma\}$.

Hence

$(*)_3$ without loss of generality $<> \neq \eta \in \mathscr{S} \Rightarrow \eta(0) \in \Gamma'(G)$ so $\mathrm{cf}(\eta(0)) = \kappa$ and $\langle\delta\rangle \in S \Rightarrow S^{[\delta]}$ analyze $G_{\delta+1}/G_\delta$

hence ([Sh 161]) without loss of generality for some $m(*) < n(\mathscr{S})$

$(*)_4$ $\eta \in \mathscr{S}_f \Rightarrow \lambda^{\mathscr{S}}_{\eta\restriction m(*)} = \sigma$.

Also without loss of generality

$(*)_5$ for all $\langle\delta\rangle \in \mathscr{S}_f$ the systems $\mathscr{S}_f^{[<\delta>]}$ are isomorphic.

This reduces us to essentially having clauses (d) + (e) of 4.1, more exactly from $S^{[<\delta>]}$ we can define $\langle G_i : i \leq \sigma\rangle$ as in 4.1(d) except possibly (e) i.e. the Whiteheadness which is guaranteed by

$\bigotimes^4_\kappa$ there is no nonfree Whitehead abelian group of cardinality $< \kappa$.

Generally also repeating ([EkSh 505]) we can get that:
Theorem (λ is strong limit singular $\kappa = 2^\lambda = \lambda^+$, $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda) = \sigma$ and $\bigotimes^4_\kappa$).
The following are equivalent:

(a) there is a strongly κ-free not free abelian group of cardinality κ which is Whitehead

$(b)(i)$ there is a strongly κ-free not free abelian group of cardinality κ

(ii) there is $\langle G^i : i \leq \sigma + 1\rangle$ increasingly continuous sequence of abelian groups such that $i \leq j \leq \sigma + 1$ & $(i, j) \neq (\sigma, \sigma + 1) \Rightarrow G^j/G^i$ free,$G^{\sigma+1}/G^\sigma$ not free, $|G^{\sigma+1}| \leq \lambda$ and $G^{\sigma+1}/G^\sigma$ is Whitehead.

[Why? $\underline{(b) \Rightarrow (a)}$ Analyze the group in (i) getting $\mathscr{S}$, κ-system for freeness (instead of the earlier (in 4.1) use $\bar{A} = \langle A_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ we now represent G and represent the $G^{\sigma+1}$ from (ii) and puts them together, also with the $\langle < \beta^\delta_t : i < \lambda >: \delta \in S\rangle$. Better analyze $G^{\sigma+1}/G^\sigma$ - like [EkSh 505].]

$\underline{(a) \Rightarrow (b)}$: Essentially said earlier.]

REFERENCES.

[EkSh 505] Paul C. Eklof and Saharon Shelah. A Combinatorial Principle Equivalent to the Existence of Non-free Whitehead Groups. In *Abelian group theory and related topics*, volume 171 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 79–98. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1994. edited by R. Goebel, P. Hill and W. Liebert, Oberwolfach proceedings.

[Sh 587] Saharon Shelah. Not collapsing cardinals $\leq \kappa$ in $(< \kappa)$–support iterations. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **submitted**.

[Sh 186] Saharon Shelah. Diamonds, uniformization. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **49**:1022–1033, 1984.

[Sh 161] Saharon Shelah. Incompactness in regular cardinals. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, **26**:195–228, 1985.

[Sh 521] Saharon Shelah. If there is an exactly λ-free abelian group then there is an exactly λ-separable one. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **61**:1261–1278, 1996.

[Sh:f] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing.* Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1998.